

***Village of Barrington***  
***Architectural Review Commission***  
Minutes Summary

Date: June 23, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson  
Joseph Coath, Vice-Chair  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner  
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jeff O'Brien, Senior Planner

***Call to Order***

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Stephen Peterson, absent; Karen Plummer, absent; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Marty O'Donnell, present. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

***Old Business***

**ARC 05-05:** Shops at Flint Creek, 500 North Hough Street (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)  
Petitioner: Todd Berlinghof, owner & Dave Duffy, architect.

Mr. Berlinghof presented different options for the front elevation of the south building. He noted that they would also be presenting samples of the proposed materials.

Mr. Duffy explained the differences in the options. He noted that the drawings gave a better representation of what the building would look like up close. He noted that the petitioner preferred Option #1, the original proposal.

Mr. Julian asked where someone would need to be to see the roofline of the south building.

Mr. Duffy stated that the one would have to 22-40 feet away from the building to see the roofline of the south building.

Mr. Duffy presented the roofing materials. He noted that the petitioner was proposed an architectural asphalt shingle with a slate look. Mr. Duffy also presented the brick. He noted that there would be a tan and red brick. He noted that the tan brick was a smoother brick. He stated that the trim was calcium-silicate.

Ms. Troy asked if the petitioner had explored the offsets.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that larger offsets would create visibility problems for tenants in the western portions of the buildings. He stated they tried to make more variations in the rooflines to eliminate the need for additional offsets.

Ms. Troy asked to see an elevation of the north building for comparison's sake.

Mr. Julian asked about the material on the back on buildings.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that the brick on the back of the buildings would be the same color and style, but a larger size.

Mr. Julian asked about the proposed mortar.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that the mortar would be a “natural” color.

Ms. Troy asked about Option #3. She noted that it provided some additional variation in the front elevation of the south building.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that they did not want to make the corner space the focal point of the development because it would take away from the architecture of the rest of the building.

There was a general discussion about which Option was the best. The ARC determined that Option #1 or Option #2 would be acceptable.

There was a general discussion about the roofing materials. The ARC asked about cedar shingles and slate shingles. The ARC determined that the asphalt shingles were appropriate.

Mr. Coath asked about the proposed offsets.

Mr. Berlinghof stated that the offsets would vary between 1-1.5 feet.

Mr. Duffy explained how the offsets would appear.

There was further discussion regarding the roof materials.

Mr. Julian asked if the ARC had any other concerns regarding the building materials.

The ARC noted that the materials were appropriate for the building.

Mr. Julian asked for ARC consensus on the preferred front elevation of the south building.

The ARC noted that Options #1 and #2 were appropriate.

Mr. O’Brien presented the staff report. He discussed landscaping and building details. He noted that staff was recommending approval with conditions.

*MOTION: Ms. Troy made a motion to recommend approval of ARC 05-05 accepting staff’s conditions and findings as the ARC’s. Mr. O’Donnell seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

*Julian – yes*

*O’Donnell – yes*

*Troy – yes*

*Coath – yes*

*Motion carries 4-0.*

**ARC 05-12:** Weyrauch Residence, 539 South Cook Street (Public Hearing – Historic)

Petitioner: Michael and Sia Weyrauch, owners & Dave Heidke, architect

Mr. Julian stated that this is a continued public hearing and that the petitioners had been sworn in previously.

Mr. Heidke presented the modifications to the proposal. He noted that the existing stucco was the original siding material. Mr. Heidke proceeded to note how the petitioner addressed the ARC's previous comments.

Mr. Heidke noted that the petitioner was proposing to use all-wood Marvin simulated divided light windows.

Ms. Troy asked if the existing front wall of the house would be modified to create the nook on the porch.

Mr. Heidke said that a portion of the existing front wall would be demolished. He noted that there was a nice leaded-glass window that the petitioner was proposing to move to the opposite side of the porch.

Mr. Coath asked for a description of the window.

Mr. Heidke explained the window was 4x4 double-hung window with an 18-inch high leaded glass transom.

Ms. Troy asked if the porch was going to be enclosed to improve the floor plan.

Mr. Heidke said yes.

There was a general discussion about the proposed window pattern.

Mr. Julian asked for public comments.

There was no public comment.

Mr. O'Brien presented the staff report and noted that staff was recommending approval provided that all-wood windows were used and the new stucco was to be cementitious, not EIFS.

Ms. Troy stated that she preferred to see the front porch all open, but she noted that the proposal would work after driving by the other examples in the Village that the petitioner provided in the packet.

*MOTION: Mr. Coath made a motion approve ARC 05-12 accepting staff's conditions and findings as the ARC's. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

*Julian – yes*

*O'Donnell – yes*

*Troy – yes*

*Coath – yes*

*Motion carries 4-0.*

**ARC 05-13:** Bank of America, 500 North Hough Street (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)

Petitioner: Tony Turek, petitioner & Luigi Francisina, architect.

The petitioner presented amended plans to the ARC and staff.

Mr. Turek stated that the petitioner was trying to create a gateway to the Shops at Flint Creek. He noted that they had modified the plans based on the staff report. Mr. Turek went over the sign issue. He stated that they were surprised by staff's comments and that they were under the impression that the bank would be governed by the Master Sign Plan for the Shops at Flint Creek. He discussed issues with using a pitched roof. He noted that they were proposing to use the same red brick as the Shops of Flint Creek, with renaissance stone and slate on the roof of the tower.

There was a general discussion about the use of a sloped roof. The petitioner noted that the sloped roof would impact the visibility of the retail center as well as require that the mechanical units to be placed on the ground.

Mr. Julian asked why the pictures of the other buildings were provided in the packet.

Mr. Francesina noted that the buildings were referred to in the staff letter and he wanted to relay that they had looked the buildings.

Mr. Julian noted that he still had concerns especially regarding having a different-type of tower close to the tower that was proposed for the Shops of Flint Creek.

Mr. Coath stated that he did not mind the flat-parapet roof. He stated that a more traditional light-division should be explored. He noted that a 4-light window might be more appropriate. Mr. Coath noted that the tower cornice should have more articulation.

Ms. Troy asked about the window material.

Mr. Francesina stated that the window would be aluminum.

Ms. Troy stated that she thought the building was an attractive building, but she thought the building should have a more residential feel. She noted that she would like to see what a sloped roofline. Ms. Troy noted that the bank building would be the most visible building in the Shops at Flint Creek development.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that he thought the building was an attractive building.

Mr. Julian stated that he would like the building to have a more residential feel. He thought that a slope roof would be more appropriate.

Mr. Turek explained that a sloped roof building might not work for the site because of the sightlines and the HVAC units.

There was a discussion about how the building should look in relation to its surroundings. The petitioner and the ARC discussed the bank building in relation to the visibility of the retail shops. There was a general discussion about the tower on the bank in relation to the tower on the north retail building of the Shops at Flint Creek.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that the bank building should not be more residential because the area was not a residential area. He stated the commercial-style building was more appropriate for the area.

There was a discussion about building details. The petitioner discussed the proposed brick and renaissance stone as well as the stamped metal canopy.

Ms. Troy asked if there could be more than one entrance to the building.

Mr. Turek explained that Bank of America only allows one entrance per building to ensure that customers have similar experiences with different facilities.

Mr. Coath stated that a brick mould should be used if possible.

There was a discussion about signage for the Bank of America.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. O'Brien if he had comments.

Mr. O'Brien stated staff's comments in the staff report did not relate to the building that was presented to the ARC. He stated that staff reviewed the building plans that were submitted earlier. Mr. O'Brien noted that the sign plan for the Shops at Flint Creek did not apply to Bank of America. He noted that the only exceptions that were given to that development were internal illumination and size.

The ARC came to a consensus on the following items:

1. The tower on the bank should relate to the tower on the north building of the Shops at Flint Creek.
2. The ARC recommends using a more traditional muntin pattern on the east elevation around the entrance.
3. The cornice details should be provided.
4. The articulation on the tower cornice should be more consistent with the main cornices.
5. The dimensions of the muntins in the windows should be accurately reflected in the renderings.
6. Explore using a hipped or gabled roof.
7. The ARC noted that to provide context, an elevation drawing showing the proposed bank building and the Shops at Flint Creek should be submitted.
8. Explore narrowing the width of the "piers" on the tower.
9. The ARC suggests using a two (2) inch brick mould around the windows.

Mr. Julian explained that the bank would need to come back to the ARC at least one more time.

#### ***New Business***

**ARC 05-16:** Velleuer Residence, 216 Dundee Avenue (Public Meeting – Historic)

Petitioner: Ron Velleuer, owner

Mr. Velleuer presented his proposal. He stated that they were looking to pursue a different strategy.

Mr. Julian stated that the ARC was upset that the Velleuer's variation request was turned down.

Mr. Velleuer stated that the new plan had nothing to do with the height variation request. He stated that the previous plan was too big and over-budget. He noted that the plan ended up not being economic and efficient for his needs. Mr. Velleuer stated that the ARC previously determined that the structure was non-contributing. He noted that the existing structure would be demolished and that is what the new plans represent.

Ms. Troy clarified that the entire existing structure would be razed.

Mr. Velleuer stated that it would be entirely demolished. He noted that the new proposal is similar in appearance to the original plan.

Mr. O'Donnell asked about the square footage of the new home.

Mr. Velleuer stated the new house will be 2,700 square feet and the original proposal was 4,300 square feet. He noted that there would be no room above the garage in this proposal.

Ms. Troy asked about the access to the property.

Mr. Velleuer stated that the access would be moved from Dundee Avenue to Lake Street.

Ms. Troy has if the curb-cut would be approved by the Village.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the Village's Public Works Department reviews curb-cuts and they had not yet seen the plan. He stated that he did not think that there would be any problems with changing the access point.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that he did not have any concerns regarding the new plans. He noted that he lived across the street from the Velleuers.

Ms. Troy asked if the front porch could be wrapped around the south side of the house.

Mr. Velleuer stated that he would like to wrap the porch around the south side of the house if their budget permits it.

Ms. Troy asked about the roof pitch.

Mr. Velleuer stated that it was 12:7 pitch and that it was steeper than what was originally proposed.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he thought the pitch was 12:8 as the previous proposal had a 12:7 pitch.

Mr. Coath noted that the box bay on the east elevation should have a foundation underneath it rather than using a cantilever.

Mr. Velleuer stated that he was working on a tight budget, but that he would be happy to explore that.

The ARC noted that there might be some cheaper alternatives to using an actual foundation.

Ms. Troy asked about spacing of the columns. She noted that the elevation and the floor plans did not match.

Mr. Velleuer stated that the elevation was more accurate than the floor plan.

Mr. Coath stated that the vertical dimension of the windows on second floor should be less than the vertical dimension of the windows on the first floor. He stated that would help with the appearance of the house.

Mr. O'Brien asked for clarification on the comment.

Ms. Troy stated that the top of the window would stay in the same location, but the sill height would be raised 4 to 6 inches.

Mr. Velleuer asked if this was a minor suggestion.

Mr. Julian stated that the ARC felt that this was a minor change that would make a big difference in the appearance of the house.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that the architect would most likely want to make the change after seeing the comment.

There was a brief discussion on the window size on the second floor. The ARC noted tempered glass windows would add a significant cost to the project and that this suggestion would help the petitioner avoid that requirement.

Ms. Troy cautioned the petitioner that changing the window size might create a problem with the Village's egress requirements.

Mr. Julian asked if the chimney would be clad with cementitious siding. He noted that the ARC would likely not approve the chimney with this appearance. He stated that the chimney should have a masonry chimney.

Mr. Velleuer stated that he did not think this was a major issue because the chimney would not be seen from the street.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that he did not care for siding-wrapped chimneys. He stated that there were other options for a chimney that would appear to be an actual masonry chimney. Mr. O'Donnell suggested internalizing the venting for the fire place and have the chimney chase come through the roof. He said that he thought this would reduce costs.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the chimney would have a foundation under it.

Mr. Velleuer said it would not be floating and would have a foundation. He stated that his budget would not allow for a brick chimney. He noted that the chimney was not on a prominent façade.

There was a general discussion about the chimney and the alternatives that were available for the petitioner to provide a masonry-looking chimney. The ARC noted that Thin-Brick and/or Z-Brick applications would not add a lot of cost to the project. The commission noted that the structural framing would be the same as proposed, the siding would be different.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that narrowing the chimney at the top and providing "shoulders" would also save materials and money. He stated that he would like to have the Velleuers explore this. He noted he had done something similar on his house.

Mr. Coath asked about the cornice details.

Mr. Velleuer stated that they were proposing to use the same detailing as the previous plan.

Mr. Coath stated that the frieze board should be 8 inches instead of 10 inches. He noted that the architect should present a detail of the area where the horizontal cornice and the raking cornice meet on the gable end.

Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Coath to clarify the area he was concerned about.

Mr. Coath explained his comment again.

There was a general discussion about the building details.

The ARC took a consensus on the following items:

1. Explore using a foundation under the box bay on the east elevation.
2. Explore reducing the vertical dimension of the second floor window openings. The sills should be higher in the bedrooms on the east side of the building.
3. The ARC recommends a masonry chimney as opposed to a chimney clad with cementitious siding. The ARC recommended either internalizing the chimney and having a masonry chimney protrude through the roof or using the "Thin Brick" or similar product to give the chimney the appearance of being masonry.
4. Explore tapering and providing "shoulders" on the chimney.
5. The ARC recommends using an eight (8) inch fascia board and a ten (10) inch frieze board. The ARC indicated that the details on the cornice may be already have the recommended dimensions and merely mislabeled.
6. A detail should be provided showing how the horizontal cornice meets the raking cornice on the front gable. This detail should also indicate how the cornices will return around the corner.

**ARC 05-17: Bread Basket Restaurant, 131 Park Avenue (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)**

Petitioner: Enrique Castel, architect

Mr. Castel presented the petition. He stated that the addition would be located on the rear of the building and accommodate accessible restroom facilities. He noted that the addition was being built as part of a deal between the owner and the Cook Street Plaza development south of the building.

Mr. Julian asked if there was going to be some improvements made to the rear facades of the buildings facing the new plaza.

Mr. O'Brien explained the approved landscape plan for Cook Street Plaza and how the Bread Basket addition fit into the overall plan. He noted that the dumpster enclosure would be constructed of the same brick.

Mr. Julian asked if they had a brick sample.

Mr. Castel explained the brick and the overall landscaped plan for the rear of the building. He noted that there would be ivy and trellises.

Mr. Coath stated he was concerned about narrowing the plaza.

Mr. O'Brien explained that it was already planned for and approved.

There was a general discussion about the need for new restroom facilities in the Bread Basket.

Mr. Julian asked about roof of the new structure. He asked how the plaza would look after construction was completed.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the plaza would be improved to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. He noted that there are agreements with the neighboring property owners that allowed the developers of Cook Street Plaza to complete the project.

Mr. Julian asked if they could add some elements to make the roof of the addition look like it had a rooftop deck.

There was a discussion about how the ARC should approach the addition given the existing plans for Cook Street Plaza. The ARC determined that the developers would make the final product look nice and that they should not put additional restrictions.

*MOTION: Mr. Coath made a motion to recommend approval of ARC 05-05 accepting staff's conditions and findings as the ARC's. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

*Julian – yes*

*O'Donnell – yes*

*Troy – yes*

*Coath – yes*

*Motion carries 4-0.*

### ***Other Business***

#### **ARC 01-20: Cook Street Plaza, 100 East Station St (Building Details)**

Mr. O'Brien presented the petitioner's proposal for the brick and the reason for the modifications. He noted that the petitioner was also requesting to use brick quoins.

The ARC noted that the brick change was appropriate. The commission noted that they would need to see a detail drawing for the proposed quoins.

### **Discussion regarding the Draft Historic Preservation Design Guidelines**

Mr. O'Brien briefly described staff's comments on the guidelines.

The ARC provided some comments on the proposed guidelines.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the ARC should provide their final comments to him no later than June 27 meeting.

***Approval of Minutes***

The ARC deferred the approval of minutes to the July 28, 2005 meeting.

***Planner's Report***

Mr. O'Brien provided information on the future cases.

***Adjournment***

Ms. Troy made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff O'Brien  
Senior Planner

---

John Julian III, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission